

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Task Force Meeting #14

151 West Mission Street, Room 202 a and b

Summary of Task Force Meeting #13 on
April 12, 2004

Task Force Members Present:

Mayor Ron Gonzales (co-chair), Councilmember Forrest Williams (co-chair), Vice Mayor Pat Dando, Supervisor Don Gage, Craig Edgerton, Chuck Butters, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Helen Chapman, Jim Cunneen, Ken Saso, Neil Struthers, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Russ Danielson, Steve Schott Jr., and Steve Speno.

Task Force Members Absent:

Christopher Platten and Terry Watt.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Kyle Simpson (Greenbelt Alliance), Mary Hughes (Habitat for Humanity) Bill Smith (Santa Clara Valley Water District), Rebecca Tolentino (City of Morgan Hill), Kathryn Nation (Senator McPherson's Office), Jane Mark (Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation), Steve Kinsella (Gavilan College), and Lisa Killough (Santa Clara County Parks).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Councilmember Linda LeZotte (District 1), Anthony Drummond (District 2), Keith Stamps (District 2), Denelle Fedor (District 10), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Timm Borden (DPW), Rebecca Flores (Housing), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Linden Skjeie (ESD), Claire Boswell (ESD), Mary Tucker (ESD), Mary Ellen Dick (ESD), Mansour Nasser (ESD), Like Vong (DOT), and William Miller SJPD).

Members of the Public:

Len Grilli, Libby Lucas, Kerry Williams, Harlen Warthan, Rebecca Van Dahlen, Patrick Lough, Lillian Ruscitto, Paul Ruscitto, Annie Saso, Tim Muller, Don Weden, Evelyn Guess, Gerald Guess, Rich and Linda Nedbal, Tim Steele, Rachel Gibson, Jessica Vernon, Sarah Muller, Andy Lief, Chris Parrott, Janet Gutierrez, Mr. And Mrs. Mansy, Wayne O'Connell, Lowell Tan, Lucy Hoeffling, Gerald Hoeffling, Eric Morely, Jim Arthur, Jon Hoeffling, Mark Sellers, Diana Borsody, Sarah Ruby, Michael Onyeack Kuza, Yonchu Joyce, Richard Joyce, Roger Costa and Maralee Potter.

Consultants:

Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates), Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Jack Hsu (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Terrence Mott (James K. M. Cheng Architects), Michial Alston (Development Design Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Darin Smith (EPS), Mike Josseyln (WRA), Eileen Goodwin (APEX), Jim Thompson (HMH), Tom Armstrong (HMH), and Chuck Anderson (Schaaf and Wheeler).

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at 5:30 p.m. with Mayor Ron Gonzales welcoming everyone in attendance to the 14th meeting of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force.

2. Acceptance of February 9, 2004 Task Force Meeting Summary

Co-Chair Forrest Williams called for a motion to accept the meeting summary for February 9, 2004. A motion was made and seconded to accept the summary, and passed unanimously.

3. Acceptance of March 13, 2004 Task Force and Community Workshop Summary

Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, stated that the Task Force members are receiving blue binders for the Land Planning phase of the Plan and each binder includes a Task Force meeting schedule, Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) planning process diagram and a copy of the PowerPoint presentation from the March 13, 2004 Community Workshop.

Sal indicated that the March 13, 2004 Task Force and Community Meeting was very successful and was attended by more than 160 people. In keeping with the theme of the workshop, which is "Listen to the Land and the Community", there was a 2-hour tour of the CVSP area in the morning, and a consultant presentation and a group visioning session in the afternoon. The community provided very good feedback about their observations and impressions of CVSP area. Land planning consultants Doug Dahlin of the Dahlin Group, Ken Kay of KenKay Associates, and Jim Musbach of Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) led the afternoon's discussions with a brief presentation on several important planning considerations for the CVSP area. These included hydrology and flooding, cultural resources, traffic and existing property ownership.

Sal explained that the group vision discussion was organized around seven major planning and urban design organizing principles including urban ecology, transportation systems and infrastructure, urban form, public spaces and public buildings, workplace, neighborhoods and gathering places. Eileen Goodwin, a sub consultant from Apex Strategies facilitated the group visioning discussion where the community provided very good comments and questions about the future of Coyote Valley. Sal added that a summary of the March 13, 2004 Task Force and Community meeting was included the new blue binders for Task Force members.

Co-Chair Forrest Williams called for a motion to accept the March 13, 2004 Task Force and Community meeting summary. A motion was made and seconded to accept the summary, and passed unanimously.

4. Discussion of Hydrology as an Element of the Environmental Footprint for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Doug Dahlin of the Dahlin Group, explained the CVSP process, and noted that the accelerated pace of the process through October 2004. Doug explained that the next community meeting scheduled for May 15, 2004, will focus on the development of three alternative land use concepts, while the subsequent community meeting on June 12, 2004, will entail a discussion and refinement of the three alternative concepts. He indicated that next two community meetings scheduled for August 7, 2004 and September 1, 2004 would respectively focus on developing a CVSP Preferred Alternative and refining the CVSP Preferred Alternative for presentation to the City Council.

On the monthly Task Force meetings, Doug explained that the next one on April 26, 2004, would continue the discussion of the environmental footprint, and potentially the numerical land use model and general financing concepts for the specific plan. On May 10, 2004, the Task Force would preview urban form concepts and a more detailed analysis of the methodology for assessing land value and the cost burden for public facilities in the CVSP area. Doug also introduced two other team members - Terrence Mott of James K. M. Cheng from Architects Inc. from Vancouver and Michial Alston of Development Design Group from Baltimore, and indicated that they would be working on the Coyote Town concept and the mid-rise residential concepts over the next

months.

Ken Kay introduced Darin Smith, of Economic Planning Systems (EPS) from Berkeley, who indicated that EPS would be presenting a land value and cost burden analysis to Task Force within the next couple of meetings. He explained that the three design schemes, which would be presented, to the Task Force by Ken Kay would show some environmental features that do not currently exist in Coyote Valley (e.g. such as detention ponds, and greenways). The schemes are preliminary concepts and need to be refined over the next several weeks through the CVSP land planning process.

Darin indicated that the Plan will also include schools, parks and major streets, and these features will inevitably fall on someone's property. There would be a process to fairly compensate owners of such properties. He stated that compensation would probably be from other property owners who will benefit from those dedications of land.

Ken Kay made a Power Point presentation of three conceptual design schemes based on hydrology as an organizing element of the environmental footprint. He reiterated that they are very conceptual, and advised the Task Force not to dwell on their effects on individual parcels at this time. Ken explained that the land planning process is interactive, and that the consultant team is "to think outside the box" in order to implement the City Council's Vision and create a model community for Coyote Valley. Ken explained that the consultants are first focusing on the hydrological issues of the environmental footprint, but will consider other environmental issues (including biotic, geology, cultural resources, transportation) as a part of the environmental footprint over the next few weeks.

Chuck Anderson of Schaaf and Wheeler briefly summarized the findings of the Hydrology Report previously prepared by his firm during the background phase of the planning process, and summarized the current hydrology of the Valley. He explained that hydrology is the study of the movement of water and how that water affects the environment, and that Coyote Valley is currently in balance in terms of hydrology. This balance must be maintained after any new the development occurs in the Coyote Valley. Coyote Valley is analogous to a bathtub in design, with Anderson Dam as the immediate source of water and the Coyote Narrows as the spigot. Chuck noted that the Valley functions as a recharge and detention area, and needs to maintain that function after it is developed. The Valley currently has a strong storage component that protects the downstream areas in San Jose during the winter months.

Ken Kay stated each of the three hydrologic schemes provides for maintenance of the existing storage capacity in Coyote Valley and provide for the additional storage capacity needed to accommodate new development in the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP).

The Task Force asked how the Coyote Canal functions. Chuck Anderson explained that it was built a long time ago to manage water and keep it from flooding the fields and that it has not been operated by the Santa Clara Valley Water District in the last couple of years.

Ken explained that the three hydrological schemes (minimum, medium and maximum concepts) might be thought of as a “kit of parts” that can be used to deal with the winter conditions (related to stormwater runoff) and the summer conditions (related to groundwater recharge). All three of the concepts have the same hydrological objectives to maintain existing water storage capacity of the Valley and provide for the additional storage capacity needed for new development envisioned in the CVSP. He explained the three schemes as follows:

- 1) Ken explained that the “Minimum Hydrological Concept” meets the following minimum objectives:
 - a. Preservation of the Coyote Creek corridor and habitat.
 - b. Realignment of Fisher Creek to the west to create a more natural riparian corridor.
 - c. Provision of increased stormwater and recharge area by using Fisher Creek.
- 2) The “Mid Hydrological Concept” meets all of the objectives of the “Minimum Hydrological Concept” and the following additional objectives:
 - a. Enhancement of Fisher Creek by providing two water corridors.
 - b. Creation of 2 East/West Water connections between Coyote Creek and Fisher Creek (to provide for additional recharge to Fisher Creek, provide an inter-connected system of creek trails and to introduce an East/West Waterway as a part of the urban fabric).
- 3) The “Maximum Hydrological Concept” meets all of the objectives of the Minimum and the Mid Hydrological Concepts and the following additional objectives:
 - a) Creation of a second East/West Water corridor between Coyote Creek and Fisher Creek (to create a buffer between the Greenbelt and Morgan Hill, provide summer water in Fisher Creek in the Urban Reserve area, increase recharge area, and provide an additional recreational loop).
 - b) Creation of lakes for habitat enhancement, recreation and visual amenities.
 - c) Creation of additional urban waterways to further define the Urban Form.

Ken acknowledged that these three alternatives might be shocking since this is the first time that the Task Force is seeing them. He reiterated Darin’s earlier statement that an equitable way would be developed to reimburse property owners whose lands are eventually required for public amenities.

Comments from the Task Force:

The Task Force asked whether the three alternatives would include the runoff from new development and take into consideration the existing high water table and its potential impacts to buildings. Ken affirmed that all three concepts would maintain the existing hydrological balance

of the Valley, and indicated that the effects of the high water table on foundation design would be considered at a later stage during development review.

The Task Force also questioned how the alternatives would impact upstream and downstream areas to the north or south of the Plan area. Ken Kay indicated that no significant impacts are expected to the north or south since one of their primary objectives is to keep the Coyote Valley in balance. He indicated that there would be further analysis by the hydrology consultants to verify that assumption.

The Task Force was concerned about maintaining the surface and ground water quality in the Valley and also questioned whether the 100-year flood plain would be changed. Ken Kay indicated that preservation of water quality is another important goal of the Plan and that the Best Management Practices for protection to water quality would be used. He also stated that the 100-year flood plain would not be changed.

The Task Force questioned whether the Maximum Concept would be more expensive in land costs since there are more surface water features shown in it. Ken indicated that there would be an economic and land cost analysis developed for each alternative soon. He also stated that the final Plan may not look like any of these three concepts, but may be a hybrid that borrows ideas from each concept.

Ken indicated that they are trying to synthesize all of the Phase I hydrologic findings and would like the Task Force's comments on these three concepts. He indicated that there was no expectation that the Task Force would make any decisions regarding their preferences, but that they would just provide initial comments to the consultant team at this point.

Mayor Gonzales reiterated that the Task Force should phrase their comments in the form of concerns rather than questions, and that the consultants will be responding to their concerns at a later date. The following additional comments and concerns were raised:

- ?? How will these alternatives enhance the Greenbelt?
- ?? Will the Plan require widening of Fisher Creek or the provision of multiple water channels?
- ?? Is the water management the responsibility of the governmental agencies?
- ?? How will the Plan address drought situations?
- ?? Will there be the potential for development between Fisher Creek and the hillsides?
- ?? What is the process for assessing these schemes and what are the expected outcomes for each?
- ?? Will the Minimum and Mid concepts require the most complex permitting?
- ?? How will these concepts affect the Coyote Creek and what will the impacts be the north and south of the Plan area if water is diverted from Coyote Creek to Fisher Creek (and if more water is coming from Anderson Reservoir)?
- ?? Would like to see more storage capacity in the south and the east in order equitably

distribute proposed hydrological features.

- ?? How will you deal with the existing homes and the proposed water flow?
- ?? What will the Santa Clara Valley Water District's involvement be?
- ?? What will the impacts be to the north and south and to the water companies in terms of water provisions and price?
- ?? How will these concepts affect the underground main from San Luis Reservoir?
- ?? How will these concepts affect the zoning of properties?
- ?? Need to address the worse case scenario of water needs through the process?
- ?? How will the water features relate to the urban form and the Greenbelt?
- ?? The habitat areas in the Valley should be preserved and enhanced.
- ?? Will consideration be given to the possibility of storing water further to the south?

3. Basic Numeric Assumption and Scaling Options

Doug Dahlin made a Power Point presentation explaining the basic numeric assumptions and scaling options for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. He indicated that this is an iterative process and illustrated several workplaces, residential and mixed-use typologies that generate land use needs for 25,000 units and 50,000 jobs, which are the basic numerical assumptions for the Plan. He illustrated an example of a 4-story workplace typology with 2-story parking and Floor Area Ratio of .6 (the ratio of building area to land area), which generates 83% of impervious surface. He explained that the amount of additional impervious surface is very important since the Valley has very critical hydrologic planning requirements, and noted that denser workplace typologies have less impervious surfacing and therefore less impact to the hydrologic equation.

Doug explained that the matrix for each land use typology includes a photo of the building type, a 3-dimensional view, and a site plan view. He explained that as he is developing the Plan he will be able to "paint with the typologies" to develop a 3-dimensional view of what the mix of typologies will look like on the ground. He will share these 3-dimensional illustrations with the Task Force to enable them to visualize the mix of land uses that are planned.

The Task Force asked whether there would be any analysis of how realistic these land-use mixes will be given the economic uncertainty. Doug explained that EPS would be conducting an economic analysis that will evaluate what is most feasible in the near and far term for the Coyote Valley area.

Doug showed residential typologies and explained that a 3-story frame building at 30 DU/AC (dwelling units per acre) would result in the need for 88% impervious surface. He stated that he has already developed about 10 typologies for workplace, residential and mixed-use land use types, and expects to reach 30 typologies for each land use category by the end of the process.

Population projects would be based on the developed typologies based on the assumption of 25,000 residential units and 50,000 jobs. The projections would be partially based on census data, typical

unit types in the area and the number of persons and students per household. These projections will then be used to determine public needs for parks, schools, libraries, and police and fire facilities. The public facility needs will be based on census data, San Jose 2020 General Plan Level of Service Policies and other land use planning standards.

Doug indicated EPS would provide information on retail land use needs. This information would also be based on the projected population, the number of households, current spending patterns and the EPS's projections for potential capture of local and regional retail uses.

He explained that with this methodology could also be used to develop projections for trunk infrastructure and environmental reserve projections (including stormwater detention and retention needs for the 5- year, 10- year, 25- year and 100-year levels).

In conclusion, he indicated the proposed methodology is being reviewed by the hydrology consultants and various City departments are.

Comments from the Task Force:

- ?? Provide background on where the various standards were derived.
- ?? Will consideration be given to a police substation or possibly a confinement facility for the project?
- ?? How will the quality of life for existing homeowners with small parcels be protected from the higher density and high-rise development on adjacent parcels (and how will the zoning be handled)?
- ?? Presentations should be e-mailed to the Task Force and should be on the web site.
- ?? Will the Plan include health facilities, churches and facilities for non-profits?
- ?? Need to look at the ABAG projections for school age children and school needs.
- ?? How will traffic be handled for the Mid and North Coyote areas and how will a Plan of this scale and intensity work with one freeway on-ramp?
- ?? Will school lands be considered for joint use with parklands?
- ?? How will school lands also be used as parks when there may be future school site closures?

4. Public Comments

- ?? Harlan Warthen from Morgan Hill indicated that he was concerned about schools and some of the existing problems facing the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD). He was concerned that a bond issue would not pass because the MHUSD has had problems in the past with bond issues. He indicated that there may be a new superintendent and possibly three new MHUSD Board members and that this Plan might triple the size of the current school district. He recommended that the Task Force strongly consider the possibility of creating a new Coyote Valley School District.
- ?? Rebecca Van Dalen, also from Morgan Hill, stated that she was concerned that current

MHUSD parents would lose their voting power regarding school issues affecting their own schools if more voters are located within San Jose than Morgan Hill.

5. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 26, 2004.

\\Pbce005\CoyoteValley_SpecificPlan\CVSP Mtgs_TASKFORCE\Meeting Summary\TFNo.14\Task Force
_Meeting # 14_4.12.04 Mtg Summary_CVSP.doc